

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

MICHELL BLANCO,

Plaintiff,

v.

JACOBY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:20-cv-00050-MMD-CSD

ORDER

Pro se Plaintiff Michell Blanco brings this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R” or “Recommendation”) of United States Magistrate Judge Craig S. Denney (ECF No. 51), recommending the Court deny Plaintiff’s motion for injunctive relief (ECF No. 40 (“Motion”)) because Blanco seeks relief in it insufficiently connected to the claims he is pursuing in this case. Plaintiff had until February 9, 2022, to file an objection. To date, no objection to the R&R has been filed. For this reason, and as explained below, the Court adopts the R&R and will deny the Motion.

The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party fails to object to a magistrate judge’s recommendation, the Court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003) (“De novo review of the magistrate judges’ findings and recommendations is required if, but *only* if, one or both parties file objections to the findings and recommendations.”) (emphasis in original); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory Committee Notes (1983) (providing that the Court “need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”).

1 Because there is no objection, the Court need not conduct de novo review, and is
2 satisfied Judge Denney did not clearly err. Here, Judge Denney explains that Blanco is
3 proceeding on Eighth Amendment claims generally regarding alleged sexual harassment
4 and retaliation. (ECF No. 51 at 1-2.) But, Judge Denney explains, in his Motion, Blanco
5 seeks an order stating that he may practice his Nation of Islam religion. (*Id.* at 2.) Judge
6 Denney accordingly recommends the Court deny Blanco's motion seeking injunctive relief
7 because the relief he seeks is insufficiently connected to his claims in this case. The Court
8 agrees with Judge Denney. Having reviewed the R&R and the record in this case, the
9 Court will adopt the R&R in full.

10 It is therefore ordered that Judge Denney's Report and Recommendation (ECF
11 No. 51) is accepted and adopted in full.

12 It is further ordered that Plaintiff Michell Blanco's motion seeking injunctive relief
13 (ECF No. 40) is denied.

14 DATED THIS 14th Day of February 2022.

15
16 

17 _____
18 MIRANDA M. DU
19 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28